## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 9 10 JASON ARTHUR ALTHEIDE, Case No.: 2:16-cv-2272-RFB-NJK 11 Plaintiff(s), **Order** 12 (Docket Nos. 75, 81) v. 13 THOMAS KLEUCZAR, et al., 14 Defendant(s). 15 16 Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's third and fourth motions to extend copywork limit. 17 Docket Nos. 75, 81. 18 An inmate has no constitutional right to free photocopying. Johnson v. Moore, 948 F.2d 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1991). Pursuant to NDOC regulations, inmates can only accrue a maximum of \$100 debt for copy work expenses for all cases. See, e.g., Weddle v. Baker, 2014 U.S. Dist. Lexis 151674, \*3 (D. Nev. Oct. 27, 2014). "In this district, courts have found that they can order a prison to extend limited photocopying when it is necessary for an inmate to provide copies to the Court and other parties." Id. (citing Allen v. Clark Cnty. Det. Ctr., 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 31756 (D. Nev. Mar. 11, 2011)). 24 25 On June 12, 2018, the Court denied Plaintiff's first and second motions to extend copywork limit. Docket No. 71; see also Docket Nos. 65, 67. In his current motion at Docket No. 75, Plaintiff submits that he requires copies of "institutional records, rules, regulations, [receipts], emails, and Sheriffs' medical [protocols] which are all hard documents (not carbon copy-able) and

necessary for support of upcoming motion for summary judgment." Docket No. 75 at 1. Plaintiff further submits he requires multiple copies of "material evidence" for the Court, "two defense counsels and copy for [him]self," and that these copies are not possible without a copywork extension. *Id.* In Docket No. 81, Plaintiff reiterates the same arguments to support his motion to extend the copywork limit. Docket No. 81.

The Court finds sufficient cause for a \$10.00 extension and, therefore, **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion. Docket No. 75. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion at Docket No. 81 as moot. The Nevada Department of Corrections shall extend Plaintiff's prison copywork limit by \$10.00. The Court advises Plaintiff to carefully consider whether he needs to file copies of each document he lists in his motions and, instead, whether he may simply cite to certain documents.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 9, 2018

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Court may take judicial notice of information on government websites. *See Daniels-Hall v. Nat'l Educ. Ass'n*, 629 F.3d 998-999 (9th Cir. 2010).